Appendix C. Statistical Methodology

MAIL LIST MODEL

Classification analysis was performed to predict the probability that an addressee on the 1992 mail list operated a farm, and thereby separated the preliminary mail list into probable farm and probable nonfarm classes. The analysis was used to reduce the preliminary census mail list of 3.78 million records to a final mail list size of 3.55 million records. All 3.55 million addresses on the final mail list received a census of agriculture report form.

Records from the 1987 final census mail list were used to build a 1992 prediction model for the 1992 analysis. Classification and Regression Trees (CART) software analyzed characteristics of known 1987 farm and nonfarm operations to determine which were most useful in predicting farm and nonfarm classes. Record characteristics such as the source of the mail list record, number of source lists on which the record appeared, expected value of agricultural sales, and geographic location were used to separate mail list records into model groups. (Sources included the previous agriculture census mail list, the Internal Revenue Service administrative records, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and special commodity lists.) The proportion of 1987 census farm records in each model group was calculated to provide an estimate of the probability that an addressee in the group operated a farm.

After the model groups were defined, each address record on the 1992 preliminary mail list was assigned to a model group by matching record characteristics to model group characteristics. Records belonging to the groups with the highest farm probability were those more likely to be farms according to the classification tree methodology. The model, followed by analyst reviews, was used to remove 229,700 records from the preliminary mail list (those in model groups with the lowest farm probability), and thereby designated the 3.55 million records with the highest farm probability to receive the census report form. This procedure was used to obtain a more complete census enumeration of farm operations without excessive respondent burden and data collection cost.

CENSUS SAMPLE DESIGN

Each of the 3.55 million name and address records on the census mail list was designated to receive one of three different types of census report forms. The three forms were the nonsample form, the screener form, and the sample form. Sections 1 through 20 and 27 through 32 of the sample form are identical to sections on the nonsample form. The sample form, sections 21 through 26, contains additional questions on usage of fertilizers and chemicals, farm production expenditures, value of machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, and farm-related income. The screener form is identical to the nonsample form with questions added in section 1 to allow quick identification of nonfarm addresses. These three different forms were used to reduce the response burden of the census, while providing reliable information on a large number of data items.

The sample form was mailed to all mail list records in Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island, and to a sample of records in other States selected from the final mail list. Addresses were selected into the sample with certainty (1) if they were expected to have large total value of agricultural products sold or large acreage, (2) if they were multiunit operations (i.e., separate farms in more than one location), (3) if they had other special characteristics, or (4) if they were in a county with less than 100 farms in 1987. Other addresses in counties containing 100 to 199 farms in 1987 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 2, and other addresses in counties containing 200 farms or more in 1987 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 6. This differential sampling scheme was used to provide reliable data for the sample sections of the report form for all counties. When a nonsample large farm was identified during processing, a supplemental form that contained the additional sample data inquiries was mailed.

To determine which mail list records would receive the screener form, all mail list records not designated for the sample were sorted by model group farm probability as specified by the mail list model. The 412,000 mail list records in the model groups with the lowest probability of being farms and with an expected total value of agricultural product sales less than \$25,000 were designated to receive the screener report form. The remaining mail list records received the nonsample report form.

CENSUS ESTIMATION

The 1992 Census of Agriculture used two types of statistical estimation procedures. These estimation procedures accounted for nonresponse to the data collection and for the sample data collection. These procedures are necessary because some farm operators never respond to

the census despite numerous attempts to contact them, and the estimates for the sample data are based on a sample of farm operators rather than a full enumeration.

Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation

A statistical estimation procedure was used to account for nonrespondent farm operators to the census. We excluded large and unique farm operations that received intensive telephone followup during census processing, assuming complete response from them. A stratified systematic sample of remaining census nonrespondents were contacted by enumerators using a computer-assisted telephone interview system. Five sample strata were defined based on expected value of sales, previous census status, and whether the record was identified by the mail list model to receive the screener report form. The nonresponse survey telephone interview was designed to provide sufficient information to determine the farm status of each record.

In situations where the nonresponse survey case could not be contacted, the contact person refused to cooperate, or when no phone number could be obtained, a screener report form was sent by certified mail.

Estimates of the proportion of census nonrespondents that operated farms were made for each stratum in the State using survey results and applied to the total number of census nonrespondents in that stratum. The number of census nonrespondents that operated farms for each county by stratum was then derived. This estimation procedure is based on the assumption that the distribution of farms in a stratum by county is the same for census nonrespondents as for census respondents.

Certain census respondent farms which exhibited "rare" commodities were designated as "ineligible" to represent census nonrespondent farms and were excluded from the nonresponse weighting operation. The procedure explained below was performed with only the eligible respondent cases: Within each stratum in a county, a noninteger nonresponse weight was calculated and assigned to each eligible respondent farm record. The noninteger nonresponse weight is the ratio of the sum of the estimated number of nonrespondent farms from the nonresponse survey and the number of eligible census respondent farms to the number of eligible census respondent farms. Stratum controls were established to ensure that this weight was never greater than 2.0. The noninteger nonresponse weight was used in the calculation of the final weight for the sample items. The noninteger nonresponse weight was randomly rounded to an integer weight of either 1 or 2 for each record for tabulating the complete count items for publication.

Table A quantifies the effect of the nonresponse estimation procedure on selected census data items. The percentages in these tables are the percents of the census values contributed by nonresponse estimation. These indicate the potential for bias in published figures resulting from nonresponse to the census. The estimates provided

in these tables do not reflect the effect of item nonresponse to individual census data items. The effect of item nonresponse is discussed in the Census Nonsampling Error section.

Table A. Percent of State Totals Contributed by Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation: 1992

Item	Percent of total
Farmsnumber Land in farmsacres_	13.7 5.9
Estimated market value of land and buildings¹\$1,000 Market value of agricultural products sold _\$1,000	1.6 1.0
Harvested cropland	4.6 4.2
Wheat for grainacres Livestock and poultry inventory:	3.8
Cattle and calvesnumber Hogs and pigsnumber Hens and pullets of laying agenumber	4.8 1.7 .2

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Sample Estimation

Sample data estimates the population totals that would have resulted from a complete census for the items in sections 21 through 26 of the sample report form. The estimates were obtained from a ratio estimation procedure that resulted in the assignment of a weight to each respondent record containing sample items. For any given county, a sample item total was estimated by multiplying the data items for each farm in the county by the corresponding sample weight and summing over all sample records in the county.

Each respondent sample farm was assigned a sample weight for use in producing estimates for all sample items. For example, if the weight given to a sample farm had the value 6, all sample data items reported by that farm would be multiplied by 6. The weight assigned to a sample certainty farm was 1.

Other than certainty farms, within a county, the ratio estimation procedure for farms was performed in three steps using three variables. The first variable contained eight 1992 total value of agricultural production (TVP) groups. Both the second and third variables, Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code and farm acreage, contained two groups. The three sets of groups were as follows:

TVP	SIC	Acres
\$1 to \$999 \$1,000 to \$2,499 \$2,500 to \$4,999 \$5,000 to \$9,999 \$10,000 to \$24,999 \$25,000 to \$49,999 \$50,000 to \$99,999 \$100,000 or more	01 All crops 02 All livestock	1 to 69 70 or more

The first step in the estimation procedure was to classify the sample records into 32 mutually exclusive initial post strata formed by the three sets of groups. The total and sample farm counts were expanded to account for nonresponse. Each cell containing sample farm records was assigned an initial sample weight equal to the ratio of the total farm count to the sample farm count. This weight was approximately equal to the inverse of the probability of selecting a farm for the census sample.

The second step in the estimation procedure was to combine, if necessary, the 32 initial post strata to increase the reliability of the ratio estimation procedure. Any stratum that contained less than 10 sample farms after nonresponse adjustment or had a weight greater than two times the mail sample rate was collapsed with another stratum. The mail sample rate was either 2 or 6, depending on whether the county had a 1 in 2 or 1 in 6 sample selection rate. The collapsing occurred within the initial 32 post strata according to a specified collapsing pattern. After the collapsing process was completed, new total farm counts and sample farm counts were computed from each of the final post strata and were used to calculate final sample weights.

The final step consisted of assigning the noninteger final post stratum weight to the sample farm records in each post stratum. The weight is the ratio of total farm count to sample farm count in each final post stratum. The noninteger sample weight, the product of the noninteger final post stratum weight and the nonresponse weight, was randomly rounded to an integer weight for tabulation. If, for example, the final weight for the farms in a particular post stratum was 7.2, then 0.2 or one-fifth of the sample farms in this post stratum were randomly assigned a weight of 8 and the remaining four-fifths received a weight of 7.

CENSUS SAMPLING ERROR

The sample for the 1992 Census of Agriculture is only one of a large number of possible samples of the same size that could have been selected using the same sample design. Sample refers to the sample for both the nonresponse survey and the selection of farms to receive the sample report forms. Estimates derived from all the possible samples would differ from each other only by random variation.

The standard error or sampling error of a survey estimate is a measure of the variation among the estimates from all possible samples and thus is a measure of the precision with which an estimate from a particular sample approximates the average result of all possible samples. The percent relative standard error of an estimate is defined as 100 times the standard error of the estimate divided by the value of the estimate.

If all possible samples were selected, each of the samples were surveyed under essentially the same conditions, and an estimate and its standard error were calculated from each sample, then:

- Approximately 90 percent of the intervals from 1.65 standard errors below the estimate to 1.65 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.
- Approximately 95 percent of the intervals from 1.96 standard errors below the estimate to 1.96 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.

The following example illustrates the computations necessary for producing a confidence interval for an estimate. Assume that the estimate of number of farms for a State is 94,382 and the relative standard error of the estimate is .1 percent (0.001). Multiplying 94,382 by 0.001 yields 94, the standard error; therefore, a 90-percent confidence interval is 94,227 to 94,537 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.65 x 94). If corresponding confidence intervals were constructed for all possible samples of the same size and design, approximately 90 percent of these intervals would contain the figure obtained from a complete enumeration. Similarly, a 95-percent confidence interval is 94,198 to 94,566 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.96 x 94).

Census items were classified as either complete count or sample count items. Complete count items were asked of all farm operators. Examples of complete count items were land in farms, harvested cropland, livestock inventory and sales, crop acreage, quantities harvested and crop sales, land use, irrigation, government loans and payments, conservation acreage, type of organization, and operator characteristics.

Sample count items were asked only of a sample of farm operators. These items appeared only in sections 21 through 26 of the sample report form. Sample count items were included under the following section headings: commercial fertilizers, chemicals, production expenses, farm machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, and farm-related income.

Variability, measured as percent relative standard error, in the estimates of complete count items is due only to the nonresponse survey estimation procedure. Variability in the estimates of sample count items is due to both the nonresponse survey estimation procedure and the census sample selection and estimation procedure. Thus, variability in the sample count item estimates tends to be larger than the variability in the complete count item estimates.

Table B provides the generalized reliability estimates of the estimated number of farms in a county reporting complete count and sample count items. The top half of the table shows the percent relative standard error for estimated number of farms in a county reporting a complete count item and the bottom half a sample count item. These are derived from regression equations. Separate regression equations were used for complete count items and sample count items. Each regression equation was fit with the estimated number of farms in a county reporting an item as the independent variable and the relative variance of that estimate as the dependent variable for all counties in the State. For sample count items, only data

from counties sampled at a rate of 1 in 6 are used in the estimation of the regression equation.

Table B. Reliability Estimates for Number of Farms in a County Reporting a Complete Count Item or Sample Count Item: 1992

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting: 25	6.1 4.3 3.5 3.0 2.4 2.0 1.6 1.2 .9 .7
SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting: 25	30.9 21.5 17.2 14.6
150	11.4 9.4 6.9 3.8 3.1 2.7 2.2 1.9

To illustrate the use of this table, assume that the estimate of the number of farms reporting hogs and pigs for a particular county, as given in county table 15, is 89. Since hogs and pigs is a complete count data item, refer to the first part of table B and use the estimated percent relative standard error of the estimate from the row with farm count equal to or just less than the estimated number of farms, 89. For this example, the percent relative standard error of the estimate comes from the row for 75 farms reporting. For sample count items, follow the same procedure using the second part of table B. For counties with fewer than 100 farms in the 1987 Census of Agriculture, variability in sample count item estimates comes only from nonresponse survey estimation procedures; thus, the estimated relative standard error for a sample count item in these counties may be obtained using the first part of table B.

Table C presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms, and table D presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms with sales of \$10,000 or more.

Table E presents the percent standard error for percent change in State totals from 1987 to 1992. The general

purpose of the percent change estimate is to provide a relative measure of the difference in a characteristic between censuses. The relative change for a given characteristic is defined as the ratio of the difference of the 1992 and the 1987 estimate for that characteristic to the 1987 estimate. This ratio is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percent change. The percent standard error of a percent change estimate, then, is the standard error of the ratio multiplied by 100.

Table F presents the percent relative standard error for State and county totals for selected data items. The percent relative standard error of the estimate for the same item differs among counties in the State. Reasons for this are differences among counties in (1) the total number of farms, (2) the number of large farms included with certainty, (3) the size classifications of the farms sampled, (4) the amount of nonresponse, (5) the general agricultural characteristics, and (6) the specific characteristic being measured.

CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

The accuracy of the census counts are affected jointly by sampling errors, described in the previous section, and nonsampling errors. Extensive efforts were made to compile a complete and accurate mail list for the census, to design an understandable report form with instructions, and to minimize processing errors through the use of quality control measures on specific operations. Nonsampling errors arise from incompleteness of the census mail list, duplication in the mail list, incorrect data reporting, errors in editing of reported data, and errors in imputation for missing data. These specific nonsampling errors are further discussed in this section. Evaluation studies will be conducted to measure the extent of certain nonsampling errors such as coverage error and classification error.

Census Coverage

The main objective of the census of agriculture is to obtain a complete and accurate enumeration of U.S. farms with accurate data on all aspects of the agricultural operation. However, the high cost and availability of resources for enumeration place restrictions on feasible data collection methodologies. The past six agriculture censuses have been conducted by mail enumeration with telephone contact for selected nonrespondents. The completeness of such an enumeration thus depends to a large extent on the coverage of farm operations by the census mail list.

The past five censuses of agriculture have included approximately 91 percent of farms in the United States and approximately 96 percent of agriculture production. Complete enumeration of agricultural operations satisfying the farm definition of \$1,000 or more in agricultural sales is complicated by fluctuations in agricultural operations qualifying for enumeration, the variety of arrangements under which farms are operated, the multiplicity of names used

by an operation, the number of operations in which an operator participates, the accuracy of data reporting, and other factors. A new mail list is compiled for each census because no current single list of agricultural operations is comprehensive.

An evaluation of census coverage has been conducted for each census of agriculture since 1945. The evaluation provides estimates of the completeness of census farm count and major census data items. In addition, the evaluation helps to identify problems in the census enumeration and provide information that can form the basis for improvements. The results of the 1992 Coverage Evaluation program will be published in volume 2, Subject Series (Part 2): Coverage Evaluation.

The evaluation of coverage for the 1992 census was designed to measure four components of error in the census mail list and in farm classification. Mail list error includes two components of error, a measurement of farms not on the census mail list (undercount) and a measurement of farms enumerated more than once in the census (overcount). Classification error includes two components of error, a measurement of farms classified as nonfarms in the census (undercount) and of nonfarms classified as farms in the census (overcount). Classification error arises from reporting and processing errors. Mail list undercount dominates all coverage errors. Net coverage error is defined as the difference between undercounted and overcounted farms. Measurements of these errors, as well as a description of the complete coverage program, will be available in the Coverage Evaluation report.

Mail List Coverage

A major problem with mail enumeration for the census of agriculture is the difficulty encountered in compiling a complete mail list. The percentage of farms included on the census mail list varies considerably by State. Several reasons have contributed to farm operator names not being included on the census mail list—the operation may have been started after the mail list was developed, the operation may be so small as not to appear in any of the agriculture-related source lists used in compiling the census list, or the operation may have been falsely classified as a nonfarm prior to mailout. A large proportion of the farms not included on the mail list are small in both acres and sales of agricultural products.

The 1992 Census of Agriculture Coverage Evaluation used the area segment sample of the 1992 June Agricultural Survey (JAS) of the National Agricultural Statistical Service (NASS) to estimate farms not on the census mail list. The Census Bureau contracted with NASS to augment the JAS data collection. The survey data collected by NASS will be protected under the confidentiality of title 13, U.S. Code. These JAS survey records were matched to the census mail list. Records that did not match were mailed a census of agriculture report form to estimate mail list

coverage. Estimates of farms not on the census mail list are computed using a capture-recapture dual frame estimator which will be described in the Coverage Evaluation report mentioned earlier.

Table G provides coverage evaluation estimates for one component of coverage error associated with the census of agriculture; that is, the error due to farms not on the census mail list. Also provided are estimates of selected characteristics of farms not on the mail list, estimates of characteristics of farms not on the mail list as a percentage of total farms in the State, and the percent relative standard error associated with each estimate. The estimate of total farms in the State is based on census farm count plus the estimated number of farms not on the census mail list. This estimate of total farms in the State was not adjusted for the components of error associated with classification and list duplication error. Estimates of these errors will be made at the regional, rather than the State level, and will be provided in the Coverage Evaluation report mentioned earlier.

Respondent and Enumerator Error

Incorrect or incomplete responses to the mailed census report form or to the questions posed by a telephone enumerator introduce error into the census data. Such incorrect information can lead, in some cases, to incorrect classification of farms. This type of reporting error is measured by the Classification Error Survey discussed later in this section. To reduce all types of reporting error, detailed instructions for completing the report form were provided to each addressee. Questions were phrased as clearly as possible based on tests of the census report form and each respondent's answers were checked for completeness and consistency.

Item Nonresponse

As information flows from data collection to tabulation, various types of item nonresponses are identified on the report forms. Nonresponse to particular questions on the report form that logically should be present may create a type of nonsampling error in both complete count and sample count data. When information from reporting farms is used to edit or impute for item nonresponse, the data may be biased due to characteristics of the nonreporting respondents differing from those reporting the item. Any attempt to correct the data items may not completely reflect this difference either at the element level (individual farm operation) or on the average.

Processing Error

All phases of processing for each report form are sources for the introduction of nonsampling error. The processing of the report forms includes clerical screening for farm activity, computerized check-in of report forms and follow-up of nonrespondents, keying and transmittal of

completed report forms, computerized editing of inconsistent and missing data, review and correction of individual records referred from the computer edit, review and correction of tabulated data, and electronic data processing. These operations undergo a number of quality control checks to ensure as accurate an application as possible, yet some errors are not detected and corrected.

Classification Error

An evaluation study of classification errors was conducted in the 1992 Census of Agriculture as part of the census coverage evaluation program. A sample of census mail list respondents was selected, and these addresses were reenumerated to determine whether they were a farm or nonfarm. A farm status determination was made based on the evaluation report form and compared with the census farm status which was based on the data reported on the report form. Differences in status were reconciled.

In past censuses, the proportion of farms undercounted due to classification errors was higher for farms with small values of sales. For the 1987 census, the classification error rate was higher for (1) farms with small values of sales, (2) farms with a small number of acres, (3) full-owner farms than part-owner or tenant farms, (4) operators with principal occupation other than farming, and (5) males than females. Results from the 1992 Classification Error Survey will be published in the Coverage Evaluation report.

EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

The Census of Agriculture Complex Edit and Imputation System performs the following functions:

- Ensuring reasonable relationships between/among data items, values for various sizes of farms, and combinations of commodities.
- Ensuring necessary consistencies are present. There are more than 70 distinct consistency requirements.
- Ensuring geographic, legal, and physical constraints are met.

The system must perform these and similar functions for 900 data keycodes for sample records and 850 data keycodes for nonsample records.

For the 1992 Census of Agriculture, as in previous censuses, all reported data were keyed and then edited by computer. The edits were used to determine whether the reports met the minimum criteria to be counted as farms in the census. The complex edit and imputation system provided the basis for deciding to accept, impute (supply), delete, or alter the reported value for each data record item.

Whenever possible, edit imputations, deletions, and changes were based on component or related data on the respondent's report form. For some items, such as operator characteristics, data from the previous census were used when available. Values for other missing or unacceptable reported data items were calculated based on reported quantities and known price parameters.

When these and similar methods were not available and values had to be supplied, the imputation process used information reported for another farm operation in a geographically adjacent area with characteristics similar to those of the farm operation with incomplete data. For example, a farm operation that reported acres of corn harvested, but did not report quantity of corn harvested, was assigned the same bushels of corn per acre harvested as that of the last nearby farm with similar characteristics that reported acceptable yields during that particular execution of the computer edit. The imputation for missing items in each section of the report form was conducted separately; thus, assigned values for one operation could come from more than one respondent.

Prior to the imputation operation, a set of default values and relationships were assigned to the possible imputation variables. The relationships and values varied depending on the item being imputed. For example, different default values were assigned for several standard industrial classification and total value of sales categories when imputing hired farm labor expenses. These values and item relationships for the possible imputation variables were stored in the computer in a series of matrices.

Each execution of the computer edit consisted of records from only one State. The computer records were sorted by reported State and county. For a given execution of the edit, the stored entries in the various matrices were retained in memory only until a succeeding record having acceptable characteristics for some sections of the report form was processed by the computer. Then the acceptable responses of the succeeding operation replaced those previously stored. When a record processed through the edit had unreported or unacceptable data, the record was assigned the last acceptable ratio or response from an operation with a similar set of characteristics. Once each execution of the computer edit for a State was completed, the possible imputation variables were reset to the default values and relationships for subsequent executions.

After the initial computer edit, keyed reports not meeting the census farm definition were reviewed to ensure that the data were keyed correctly. Edit referrals were generated for about 25 percent of the reports included as farms; they were reviewed for keying accuracy to ensure that the computer edit actions were correct. If the results of the computer edit were not acceptable, corrections were made and the record was reedited.

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
			(1-1-1-1-1)	FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES ¹			
Farms		2 633	1.4	Total farm production expenses	farms	2 627	1.5
Land in farms Average size of farm		589 189 224	.8 1.6		\$1.000	448 199 170 613	.3 1.5
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL					\$1,000	1 192 64 080	3.1 .6
PRODUCTS SOLD				Feed for livestock and poultry	\$1,000	1 367 189 867	3.1 .4
Total sales (see text)	farms	2 633	1.4	Commercially mixed formula feeds	\$1,000	1 161 180 811	2.8 .4
Average per farm	\$1,000	559 766 212 596	.1 1.4	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees	farme	1 745	2.6
		212 330	1.4	Commercial fertilizer	\$1,000	10 470 1 666	1.1 2.9
Farms by value of sales: Less than \$1,000 (see text)		201	3.3		\$1.000	19 838 1 834	2.1 2.6
\$1,000 to \$2,499	\$1,000 farms	58 191	4.4 3.7	Petroleum products	\$1,000	15 272 2 380	1.2 1.8
\$2,500 to \$4,999	\$1,000 farms	309 213	3.9 3.3		\$1,000	10 367	1.3
\$5,000 to \$9,999	\$1 000 I	773 252	3.3 3.2	Electricity	farms	1 980	2.5
\$10,000 to \$19,999	\$1 000 I	1 760 234	3.3 3.7	Hired farm labor	\$1,000	6 082 946	.7 3.9
\$20,000 to \$24,999	\$1.000	3 291 67	3.8 5.6		\$1,000	23 911	.7 6.4
Ψ20,000 to Ψ24,000	\$1,000	1 490	5.6		\$1.000	314 3 674	.8
\$25,000 to \$39,999	farms	147	4.4		\$1,000	2 280 16 222	2.1 1.2
\$40,000 to \$49,999	\$1,000 farms	4 638 55	4.5 5.4	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment	farms	1 134	4.3
\$50,000 to \$99,999	\$1,000	2 452 182	5.4 3.2	Interest expense	\$1,000 farms	2 849 1 270	4.3 3.2
\$100,000 to \$249,999	\$1.000	13 425 381	3.1	Secured by real estate	\$1,000 farms	16 664 978	1.5 3.5
\$250,000 to \$499,999	\$1.000	65 099 437	_	Not secured by real estate	\$1,000 farms	13 084 622	1.7 4.8
\$500,000 or more	\$1,000	158 306 273	-	· ·	\$1,000	3 580	3.1
	\$1,000	308 166	=	Cash rent	farms	785	4.7
Sales by commodity or commodity group: Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	farms	1 830	1.6	Property taxes	\$1,000 farms	13 804 2 491	1.4 1.7
Grains	\$1,000 farms	142 963 1 585	.4 1.7	All other farm production expenses	\$1,000 farms	3 176 2 409	2.9 1.9
Corn for grain	\$1,000 farms	85 854 928	.6 1.7		\$1,000	51 925	.5
Wheat		33 937 590	.6 1.7				
Soybeans	\$1,000 farms	10 209 1 318	.7 1.7	NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL			
Sorghum for grain	farms	36 034 157	.7 2.3	SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT) 1			
Barley	\$1,000 farms	1 257 295	1.5 1.8				
Oats	\$1,000 farms	4 164 15	.5 7.5	All farmsn	number \$1.000	2 627 108 998	1.5 1.1
Other grains	\$1,000	40 44	8.2 4.1	Average per farm	dollars	41 491	1.8
Outor granto	\$1,000	212	1.7	Farms with net gains ² r		1 774	2.5
Cotton and cottonseed		-	-	Average net gain	\$1,000 dollars	117 486 66 227	.7 2.6
Tobacco	\$1,000 farms	-	_	Farms with net lossesn		853	E 4
Hay, silage, and field seeds	\$1,000 farms	217	2.6		\$1,000	8 488	5.1 8.8
	\$1,000	1 268	3.5	Average net loss	dollars	9 951	10.1
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons	farms \$1,000	271 22 567	1.9 .3				
Fruits, nuts, and berries	\$1,000 farms \$1.000	50 3 214	4.3 .2				
	* /			FARM-RELATED INCOME			
Nursery and greenhouse crops	\$1 000 l	117 21 332	2.6 .3				
Other crops	farms \$1,000	28 8 729	4.2 (L)	Government payments	\$1.000	268 1 962	1.8 .8
Livestock, poultry, and their products					\$1,000	658 3 734	5.7 5.5
	\$1,000	1 380 416 802	.9 .1	Customwork and other agricultural services	farms \$1,000	215 2 213	11.1 7.7
Poultry and poultry products	\$1,000	372 775	.5 .1	Gross cash rent or share payments	\$1.000	260 893	9.8 13.2
Dairy products	\$1,000	109 17 648	2.6	Forest products and Christmas trees	farms \$1,000	66 324	19.2 21.8
Cattle and calves	\$1,000	337 15 016	2.1 .3 2.3	Other farm-related income sources	farms \$1,000	218 304	10.4 22.9
Hogs and pigs	\$1,000	195 10 460	.7		,000==	00-1	22.5
Sheep, lambs, and wool	1,000	62 80	4.4 20.2				
Other livestock and livestock products (see text)	farms	155	3.5	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS			
,	\$1,000	824	5.4	LOANO			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to	form: -	444	0.1	Total	form -	47	0.0
individuals for human consumption (see text)	farms \$1,000	144 1 906	3.1 1.6	Total	farms \$1,000	47 1 406	2.6 .5

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992 -Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]		Relative			Relative
Item	Total	standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			TENURE OF OPERATOR		
Total cropland farms	2 162	1.6	All operators farms acres	2 633 589 189	1.4 .8
acres Harvested cropland farms	. 1 956	.7 1.6	Full owners farms	1 607	1.4 2.1
Farms by acres harvested:		.7	acres Part owners farms	121 114 788	1.5
1 to 9 acresfarms		2.4 2.8	acres Tenantsfarms	403 884 238	1.5 .5 2.6
acresfarms	. 226	3.0	acres	64 191	1.3
acresfarms	3 043 150	3.0 3.3	OWNED AND DENTED LAND		
acresfarms	. 3 440	3.3 3.1	OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
acres_	7 980	3.1	Land owned farms	2 402	1.3
50 to 99 acresfarms _	. 300	2.9	Owned land in farmsfarms	321 877 2 395	1.1 1.3
acres	20 668	2.9 3.2	acres	293 927	1.1
acres	. 36 119	3.2	Land rented or leased from othersfarms	1 038 298 523	1.5
200 to 499 acresfarmsfarms	. 87 681	2.1 1.9	acres landlords	3 894	.6 1.2
500 to 999 acresfarmsfarms		.5 .4	Rented or leased land in farmsfarmsacres	1 026 295 262	1.5 .6
1,000 acres or morefarms _	. 110	-	Land rented or leased to othersfarms	446	1.7
acres	. 216 910	_	acres	31 211	2.4
Cropland:	500	2.0			
Pasture or grazing only farms acres	. 9 630	2.0 2.3	OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
Other cropland farms _ acres_		1.6 1.6			
			On farm operated	1 956	1.4
Total woodland farms acres		1.6 1.5		436 241	2.0 2.0
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured farms	. 194	2.6	Operators by principal occupation:		
acres_ Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etcfarms	. 5 510	1.7 1.3	FarmingOther	1 578 1 055	1.3 1.9
acres	. 22 306	2.1	Operators by days worked off farm:		
Irrigated land farms acres		1.6 .4	Any	1 287	1.7
A constitution to di			,	849	1.8
Acres irrigated: 1 to 9 acresfarms		3.1	Operators by sex: Male farms	2 346	1.4
acres_ 10 to 49 acresfarms _	. 359 . 51	3.8 4.6	acres Female farms	565 832 287	.8 1.6
acres	1 283	4.1 3.5	acres	23 357	2.1
acres	3 409	3.4	Average age of operatoryears	52.7	2.0
100 to 199 acresfarmsacres	. 6 390	2.6 2.4			
200 to 499 acresfarmsfarms		_	FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
500 to 999 acres	. 25	-	La dividual au faucit. (cala grandistantia)	0.000	4.5
1,000 acres or morefarms _	. 10	_	Individual or family (sole proprietorship)farms acres	2 226 379 091	1.5 1.1
acres_	. 16 997	-	Partnership farms acres	213 66 523	2.2 1.3
Harvested cropland irrigatedfarms _	342	1.6	Corporation: Family held farms	172	1.3
acres Pasture and other land irrigatedfarms	. 14	.4 7.7	acres	138 660	.2
acres	. 180	14.0	10 or less stockholdersfarms	8 164	1.4
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:	470	4.0	Other than family heldfarms	9	9.2
Diverted under annual commodity programsfarms _ acres		1.8 .5	acres	2 184	8.0
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs farms_	. 37	5.1	10 or less stockholdersfarms	9	9.2
acres		5.5	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etcfarms	13	8.3
			acres	2 731	.8
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS 1					
			HIRED FARM LABOR		
Estimated market value of land and buildingsfarmsfarms	. 2 627 1 350 689	1.5 1.6	Hired workers by days worked:		
Average per farmdollars _	. 514 156	2.2	150 days or morefarms	494 1 504	4.7 1.7
Average per acredollars _	. 2 246	2.2	Less than 150 days farms	788	4.9
			workers	3 226	3.1
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT 1			INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Estimated market value of all machinery and					
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment	2 611	1.5	Farm-related injuries: Operator and family members farms	20	6.4
\$1,000 Average per farmdollars	. 177 139 67 843	2.2 2.7	number	20 21	6.1
•			Hired workers farms number	19 33	3.6 2.1
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ¹			Farm-related deaths:		
ACTIOCE TOTAL OTTENHOALD			Operator and family members farms	4	16.8
Commercial fertilizer farms_		3.0	number Hired workers farms	4	16.8
acres on which used		1.5	number	-1	_

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992 —Con.

[1 of meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]			_		
ltem	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY SIZE			LIVESTOCK		
1 to 9 acres	421 1 944 797 19 217 194 11 246 186 15 255 202 23 378	1.4 1.7 1.6 1.8 2.9 2.9 3.0 3.0 3.2 3.2	Cattle and calves inventory farms	411 28 838 204 2 856 137 8 659 337 22 655 15 016 205 58 913 195 118 100 10 460	2.0 .8 2.8 3.3 2.6 .5 2.1 .4 .3 2.4 .7 2.3
140 to 179 acres farms 180 to 219 acres farms 220 to 259 acres farms 260 to 499 acres farms 500 to 999 acres farms acres acres acres acres acres acres	143 22 493 93 18 280 6 1 14 442 244 87 607 161 111 244	3.4 3.4 4.2 4.2 4.5 2.3 2.2 1.1	Sheep and lambs of all ages inventoryfarms Sheep and lambs soldfarms Horses and ponies inventoryfarms Horses and ponies soldfarms number POULTRY	72 1 856 48 1 534 374 2 672 113 332	4.2 6.6 5.1 14.7 2.5 3.1 3.9 4.2
1,000 to 1,999 acres	89 117 283 42 146 800	- - - -	Chickens 3 months old or older inventoryfarms number Hens and pullets of laying agefarms number Broilers and other meat-type chickens soldfarms number	117 739 248 112 510 718 870 223 328 864	3.4 1.1 3.4 .7 .3 .1
FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION			CROPS HARVESTED Corn for grain or seed	1 029 154 240 18 142 044 115	1.7 .7 .6 2.6
Cash grains (011) farms	1 019 311 370 89 18 806 82 44 598 46 153 90 4 715 42 15 845	2.3 1.3 4.0 2.5 3.9 .7 7.8 1.3 2.9 4.7 2.4	acres tons, green Wheat for grain	9 446 141 023 599 61 754 3 324 145 323 37 520 2 605 621 1 324 231 872 6 948 357 24 5 191 1 175 090	2.4 4.4 1.7 8.8 7.7 1.8 6.5 1.7 8.8 4.1 (L)
Dairy farms (024)	26 272 83 36 239 878 111 769 126 4 734 22 10 688	3.2 1.5 2.8 .7 .4 .1 3.9 6.6 7.1	green chop, etc. (see text)	428 11 947 30 451 283 4 991 15 316 271 42 380 25 1 260	2.1 2.0 1.9 2.3 1.9 1.9 3.3 5.7

¹Data are based on a sample of farms. ²Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than \$1,000.

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	ltem	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			<u> </u>	FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES ¹		
Farms		1 776	1.2	Total farm production expensesfarms	1 768 441 772	1.2 .3
Land in farms Average size of farm		548 485 309	.7 1.4	Average per farmdollars	249 871	1.2
				Livestock and poultry purchasedfarms	1 060 63 235	2.4 .4
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD				Feed for livestock and poultry	1 146 189 394 1 049 180 735	2.5 .4 2.1 .4
Total sales (see text)		1 776	1.2	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees	1 152 10 181 1 086	2.2 1.0
Average per farm	\$1,000 dollars	556 866 313 551	.1 1.2	\$1,000	19 201 1 296	2.2 2.1 2.0
Forms by value of colors				Agricultural chemicals farms \$1,000_c	14 837 1 596	1.2
Farms by value of sales: \$10,000 to \$19,999		234	3.7	Petroleum productsfarms\$1,000	9 780	1.4 1.0
\$20,000 to \$24,999		3 291 67	3.8 5.6	Electricityfarms \$1,000_	1 545 5 912	2.0 .6
\$25,000 to \$39,999	\$1,000 farms	1 490 147	5.6 4.4	Hired farm labor farms	831	3.2
\$40,000 to \$49,999	\$1,000 farms	4 638 55	4.5 5.4	\$1,000_ Contract labor farms_	23 737 265	.6 4.2
	\$1,000	2 452	5.4	\$1,000 Repair and maintenance farms	3 664 1 659	.8
\$50,000 to \$99,999		182	3.2	\$1,000 Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery	15 414	1.5 1.0
\$100,000 to \$249,999	\$1,000 farms	13 425 381	3.1	and equipment farms	832	3.8
\$250,000 to \$499,999	\$1,000 farms	65 099 437	_	\$1,000_ Interest expensefarms	2 611 1 077	4.2 2.6
\$500,000 or more	\$1,000	158 306 273	_ _	\$1,000 Secured by real estatefarms	16 083 871	1.1 2.9
Sales by commodity or commodity group:	\$1,000	308 166	-	\$1,000_ Not secured by real estatefarms _	12 675 514	1.3 3.6
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	farms \$1,000	1 206 140 611	1.6 .4	\$1,000	3 408	2.9
Grains	farms \$1,000	1 099 83 963	1.6 .6	Cash rent farms	705	4.1
Corn for grain	farms \$1,000	760 33 432	1.6	Property taxes farms	1 674	1.4 1.5
Wheat	farms	512	.6 1. <u>6</u>	\$1,000 All other farm production expensesfarms	2 662 1 768	1.5 2.9 1.2
Soybeans	\$1,000 farms \$1,000	10 027 965 34 935	.7 1.6 .7	\$1,000	51 342	.4
Sorghum for grain	farms	119	2.0	NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL		
Barley	\$1.000	1 193 272	1.4 1.7	SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT) 1		
·	\$1.000	4 129	.5			
Oats	\$1,000	12 38	8.2 8.5	All farmsnumber	1 768	1.2
Other grains	\$1,000	39 209	3.9 1.7	\$1,000 Average per farmdollars	112 273 63 503	.9 1.5
Cotton and cottonseed	farms \$1,000	_	-	Farms with net gains ² number \$1,000	1 518 116 940	1.9
Tobacco	farms	-	_	Average net gaindollars	77 035	.7 2.0
Hay, silage, and field seeds	farms	121	2.7	Farms with net lossesnumber	250	9.4
	\$1,000	1 083	4.0	\$1,000 Average net lossdollars	4 667 18 668	7.5 12.0
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons	farms \$1,000	211 22 459	1.8			
Fruits, nuts, and berries	farms \$1,000	33 3 194	.3 4.2 .2	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Nursery and greenhouse crops		. 82	2.9	PARM-REATED INCOME		
Other crops	\$1,000 farms	21 188 21	2.9 .3 2.3			
	\$1,000	8 723	(L)	Government payments farms \$1,000		1.8 .6
Livestock, poultry, and their products		1 158	.7	Other farm-related income ¹ farms \$1,000	467 3 087	4.7 4.5
Poultry and poultry products	\$1,000 farms	416 256 918	.1 .4	Customwork and other agricultural servicesfarms \$1,000	167 1 991	8.7 6.4
Dairy products		372 732 105	.1 2.5	Gross cash rent or share paymentsfarms	171 703	7.0 7.9
Cattle and calves		17 643 229	.4 2.0	Forest products and Christmas treesfarms \$1,000_		18.1 10.0
Hogs and pigs		14 781 151	.2 2.3	Other farm-related income sourcesfarms	188 211	9.7 3.0
Sheep, lambs, and wool	\$1,000 farms	10 362 30	.7 5.6	\$1,000		0.0
Other livestock and livestock products (see	\$1,000	67	24.0	COMMODITY CREDIT CORRORATION		
text)	farms \$1,000	71 671	4.4 6.4	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text)	farms \$1,000	88 1 833	3.2 1.6	Totalfarms \$1,000	45 (D)	2.3 (D)

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1992—Con.

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE		,	FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
Total cropland farms	1 369	1.5	Individual or family (sole proprietorship)farms	1 446	1.3
acres Harvested croplandfarms	473 063 1 257	.7 1.6	acres Partnership farms		1.0 2.1
acres	453 687	.6	acres	63 772	1.3
Cropland: Pasture or grazing only farms	278	2.0	Corporation: Family held farms	156	1.1
acres	6 981	2.4	acres	138 042	.2
Total woodland farms	843	1.5	10 or less stockholdersfarms	148	1.2
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and	53 542	1.4	Other than family heldfarms	8	8.3
woodland pastured farms	104	2.7	acres		(D)
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etcfarms	4 519 1 152	1.3 1.1	10 or less stockholdersfarms	8	8.3
Irrigated land farms	17 361 309	1.9 1.5	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etcfarms	9	7.8
acres	61 564	.4	acres	(D)	(D)
Harvested cropland irrigated farms acres	307 61 434	1.5 .4	HIRED FARM LABOR		
Pasture and other land irrigatedfarms	6	8.3	Hired workers by days worked:	454	2.2
acres	130	18.0	150 days or more farms workers	451 1 461	3.2 1.2
Land under federal acreage reduction programs: Diverted under annual commodity programsfarms	169	1.7	Less than 150 daysfarmsworkers		4.0 2.8
acres	3 661	.5	INJURIES AND DEATHS	3 043	2.0
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs farms	27	5.7			
acres	754	5.3	Farm-related injuries: Operator and family membersfarms		6.1
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS 1			number	15 19	5.7 3.6
Estimated market value of land and buildingsfarms	1 768	1.2	number		2.1
\$1,000 L	1 184 416	1.1	Farm-related deaths:		
Average per farmdollarsdollarsdollars	669 918 2 154	1.6 1.7	Operator and family membersfarmsnumber		24.8 (D)
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT 1			Hired workers farmsnumber	(b) - -	(D) - -
Estimated market value of all machinery and			FARMS BY SIZE		
equipment farms	1 768	1.2	1 to 9 acres		.9 .9
\$1,000 Average per farmdollars	159 278 90 089	2.0 2.4	10 to 49 acres 50 to 69 acres		.9 2.8
			70 to 99 acres		2.8 2.8 3.6
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ¹			140 to 179 acres	122	3.4
Commercial fertilizer farms	1 084	2.2	180 to 219 acres		4.2 4.6
acres on which used	375 959	1.5	260 to 499 acres	237	2.2
TENURE OF OPERATOR			500 to 999 acres	89	1.1
All operators farms	1 776	1.2	2,000 acres or more	42	_
Full owners farms	548 485 976	.7 1.2	FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL		
acres	90 004	2.1	CLASSIFICATION		
Part owners farms acres	652 397 313	1.4 .5	Cash grains (011)	576	2.7
Tenants farms	148 61 168	2.7 1.3	Cash grains (011) Field crops, except cash grains (013) Vegetables and melons (016) Fruits and tree nuts (017) Horticultural specialties (018)	21 52	5.9 4.3
acres	61 100	1.3	Fruits and tree nuts (017)	6	7.5
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			General larms, primarily crop (019)	59 18	3.1 4.8
Land owned farms	1 634	1.2	Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties		4.0
Owned land in farms farms	280 745 1 628	1.0 1.2	Dairy farms (024)	1 80 1	2.7
acres	259 385	1.0	Poultry and eggs (025)	868	.3 7.3
Land rented or leased from othersfarms	807	1.5	General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029)		
acres landlords	291 272 3 518	.6 1.2	specialites (U23)	13	7.6
Rented or leased land in farmsfarmsacres	800 289 100	1.5	LIVESTOCK		
		.6	Cattle and calves inventoryfarms	245	1.9
Land rented or leased to othersfarms acres	312 23 532	1.4 1.8	number Beef cows farms	26 918	.7 2.8
			number	2 106	3.6
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			Milk cows farmsnumber	109 8 617	2.5 .5
Operators by place of residence:			Cattle and calves soldfarms	229	2.0
On farm operatedNot on farm operated	1 324 269	1.2 2.0	number	22 155	.3
Not reported	183	1.7	\$1,000 Hogs and pigs inventory farms	14 781 154	.2 2.3 .7
Operators by principal occupation:			number Hogs and pigs soldfarms	57 775	.7
Farming	1 287 489	1.1 1.8	number	151 116 838	2.3
Other	469	1.8	\$1,000	10 362	.7
Operators by days worked off farm: Any	733	1.6	Sheep and lambs of all ages inventoryfarmsnumber_	37 1 390	4.9 7.8
200 days or more	421	1.6	Sheep and lambs soldfarms	25	6.0
Operators by sex:			number	1 191	18.4
Male	1 578	1.3	Horses and ponies inventoryfarms	153	3.1
Female	198	1.0	number Horses and ponies soldfarms	53	3.4 4.7
Average age of operatoryears	51.4	1.8	number		5.0

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1992 - Con.

ltem	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
POULTRY			CROPS HARVESTED—Con.		
Chickens 3 months old or older inventoryfarms number_	70 732 382	3.8 1.1	Barley for grainfarmsacres bushels	297 37 100 2 581 141	1.8 .6
Hens and pullets of laying agefarms number_	509 169	3.8 .7	Soybeans for beans farms acres	971 222 266	.5 1.6 .8 .7
Broilers and other meat-type chickens soldfarms number_	223 328 135	.3 .1	bushels Irish potatoesacres acres	6 718 529 20 5 190	3.5 (L)
CROPS HARVESTED			cwt Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)farms	1 174 950 248	(L) 2.2
Corn for grain or seedfarmsacresbushels	827 151 009 17 847 100	1.6 .6 .6	acres	9 891 26 426 180	2.1 2.0 2.3
Corn for silage or green chopfarms acres	104 9 364	2.4 .4	acres tons, dry	4 014 12 928 211	2.0 2.0
tons, green tons, green farms acres bushels	139 909 521 60 080 3 258 933	.4 1.6 .7 .7	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)farms acres Land in orchardsfarms acres	42 215 42 215 15 1 246	1.8 .3 6.3

¹Data are based on a sample of farms. ²Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than \$1,000.

Table E. Reliability Estimates of Percent Change in State Totals: 1987 to 1992

Nome	All fai	rms	Farms with sales of \$1	0,000 or more
Item	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate
Farmsnumber	-11.2	1.4 .9	-4.5 1.5	1.:
Land in farmsacresacresacresacresacresacresacresacresacresacresacresacres	-3.1 9.3	2.0	6.2	.9 1.7
Estimated market value of land and buildings 1: Average per farmdollars Average per acredollars	39.1 27.3	3.8 3.9	34.2 26.0	2.9 3.3
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment 1: Average per farmdollars	26.9	4.4	22.5	4.0
Farms by size:	-18.1	1.5	-19.3	1.0
10 to 49 acres	-8.1 -8.0	1.9 2.4	-10.1 -24.3	1. 1. 3.
180 to 499 acres	-17.3	2.3	-9.9	2. 1.
1,000 to 1,999 acres	-14.4 -11.0 50.0	1.4 - -	-15.4 -10.1 50.0	1.
Total croplandfarmsacres	-9.8 -1.2	1.6 .9	.7 3.3	1.
Harvested croplandfarms acres	-9.9 6.5	1.6 .9	.6 11.2	1.
rrigated landfarms	-8.3	1.8	-2.2	1.
acres_	1.6	.5	2.1	
Market value of agricultural products sold\$1,000	26.2 42.2	.2 2.2	26.6 32.5	 1.8
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops \$1,000 Livestock, poultry, and their products \$1,000	48.7 20.0	.8 .1	50.5 20.1	.ī.
Farms by value of sales: Less than \$2,500	-27.4	2.1	(X)	()
\$2,500 to \$4,999 \$5,000 to \$9,999	-21.1 -15.2	3.3 3.3	(X) (X) (X) 7.5	() () () 4.
\$10,000 to \$24,999	7.5	4.6	7.5 7.5	4.
\$25,000 to \$49,999	-5.6 -29.2	4.4 2.7	-5.6 -29.2	4. 2.
\$100,000 to \$249,999\$250,000 to \$499,999	-30.6 8.4	_	-30.6 8.4	
\$500,000 or more	75.0	-	75.0	
Total farm production expenses 1\$1,000_ Average per farmdollars	18.9 34.1	1.8 2.3	19.2 25.9	1.5 1.5
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) 1farms \$1,000_	-11.4 66.9	1.5 3.2	-5.3 64.3	1. 2.
Average per farmdollars	88.4	4.8	73.4	3.
Operators by principal occupation: FarmingOtherOther	-11.0 -11.5	1.3 2.0	-6.2 .4	1. 2.
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any	-9.7 -11.1	4.8 4.7	.1 -3.7	5.: 5.
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventoryfarmsnumber	–10.8 –7.5	2.2 .9	-9.6 -8.1	2.
Beef cowsfarmsnumber	-5.6 30.6	3.4 5.6	-1.0 43.2	3. 7.
Milk cowsfarms number	-18.9 -7.4	2.7 .8	-17.4 -7.0	2.
Cattle and calves soldfarmsnumber	-10.4 -15.9	2.4 .4	-2.1 -14.5	2.
Hogs and pigs inventory	-31.9 18.5	2.0 1.2	-30.0 19.6	1. 1.:
Hogs and pigs soldfarms number_	-37.1	1.8	-33.5	1. 1. 1.:
Sheep and lambs inventoryfarms	7.8 44.0	1.2 8.8	9.2 94.7	12.0
Chickens 3 months old or older inventoryfarms	11.3 -33.1	12.1 2.9	35.7 -21.3	11.9 3.
Broilers and other meat-type chickens soldnumber number	-11.4 -13.1 6.1	1.4 .5 .1	-11.3 -13.2 6.1	1.
Selected crops harvested:	0.1		0.1	·
Corn for grain or seed	-4.4 18.4	1.9 1.0	2.1 21.1	1.3 1.0
bushels_ Wheat for grainfarms	83.7 -4.9	1.4 2.0	85.4 8.1	1.: 1.: 2.
acres	41.7	1.6	49.0	1.0
bushels Barley for grainfarms	81.9 -10.3	2.1 2.1	89.6 -4.2	2. 2.
acres bushels	14.9 37.3	1.1 1.3	17.6 40.3	1. 1.
Soybeans for beans	-12.6 5.4	1.7 1.1	5 12.0	1. 1.
	67.7	1.7	73.9	1.
bushels	07.7	***		
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)farms	-20.6	2.0	-12.1	2.
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop,				2. 1. 1. 2.

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

[FOI meaning of appreviation	ono ana oymba	713, 300 IIII Oddi	Diory text]									
	F	arms		Land in farm	s	Average siz	ze of farm	Average and be	market value o uildings per far	f land E m ¹	stimated market machinery and e	
Geographic area	Tota (numbe		lard or of nate	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent	1 : : \	/alue s	Relative standard error of estimate percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Delaware Kent New Castle Sussex	2 63 78 33 1 51	2 6	1.9 1.3	889 189 97 375 87 134 804 680	.8 1.1 .9 .8	224 252 259 201	1.6 2.2 1.6 1.4	510 853	156 070 261 133	2.2 3.1 4.6 2.4	177 139 55 198 24 893 97 048	2.2 4.2 5.1 2.6
	machinery ar	arket value of a nd equipment p farm ¹	ll Marke	et value of agr products sol		Average mar agricultural pro far	ducts sold per		Farm	n production e	xpenses ¹	
									Total fa	arm productio	n expenses	
Geographic area									Farms		Value	
	Valu (dollars		lard or of nate	Total \$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent	1	s	Relative standard error of estimate percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Delaware Kent New Castle Sussex	67 84 70 85 75 43 64 61	7 4	4.8 1 5.4	659 766 11 769 40 289 407 707	.1 .3 .3 .1	212 596 142 927 119 908 269 114	1.4 1.9 1.3 1.2	9 3	627 780 335 512	1.5 2.2 1.4 1.3	448 199 94 528 35 642 318 030	. 3 .8 1.2 .3
						Farm production	expenses 1—Co	n.				
Geographic area	Li	vestock and po	ultry purchase	d	Feed for livestock and poultry				Se	eeds, bulbs, p	lbs, plants, and trees	
	Far	ms	Va	Value		Farms		Value		rms	Va	lue
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Delaware	1 192 291	3.1 8.9	64 080 7 858	.6 3.8	1 36	7 3.1 6 7.3	189 867 27 452	.4 1.1	1 745 588	2.6 4.1	10 470 3 570	1.1 2.0
New Castle Sussex	33 868	20.9 2.8	1 470 54 753	7.3 .4		8 15.2 3 3.1	3 206 159 210	.9 .4	224 933	6.4 2.9		1.7 1.6
						Farm production	expenses 1—Co	n.				
		Commerci	al fertilizer			Agricultura	l chemicals			Petroleu	m products	
Geographic area	Far	ms	Va	lue	F	arms	Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Delaware Kent New Castle Sussex	1 666 573 263 830	2.9 4.9 4.2 3.7	19 838 7 439 3 642 8 757	2.1 2.1 4.4 3.9	56 23	7 4.7 4 5.9	15 272 5 817 1 720 7 735	1.2 2.1 2.0 1.6	2 380 732 307 1 341	1.8 2.7 3.5 1.9	3 520 1 713	1.3 2.5 2.9 1.7
						Farm production	expenses 1—Co	n.				
		Elect	ricity			Hired fa	rm labor			Contra	act labor	
Geographic area	Far	ms	Va	lue	F	arms	Valu	ie	Fa	rms	Va	lue
5 ,	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Delaware Kent New Castle Sussex	1 980 560 222 1 198	2.5 5.5 6.3 2.7	6 082 1 396 777 3 909	. 7 2.1 2.3 .7	23	4 9.2 3 11.0	23 911 7 301 5 872 10 738	. 7 1.1 1.8 .9	314 84 43 187	6.4 14.4 19.9 7.3	1 368 1 286	. 8 1.7 1.3 .3

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

[For meaning of abbreviati	ons and symbo	is, see introduc	cory text]		Fa	rm production	expenses 1—Co	n.					
		Repair and m	naintenance		Customwork	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest expense			
Geographic area	Farı	ms	Val	ue	Far		Valu	ie	Farms Valu			ue	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Delaware Kent New Castle Sussex	2 280 703 291 1 286	2.1 3.5 4.0 2.4	16 222 5 076 2 774 8 371	1.2 2.2 2.8 1.4	1 134 366 118 650	4.3 8.4 11.8 5.1	2 849 871 550 1 428	4.3 8.0 6.2 6.5	1 270 359 122 789	3.2 7.5 11.6 3.3	16 664 5 483 1 656 9 525	1.5 3.0 7.7 1.4	
					Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.								
	Cash rent					Property to	axes paid		All	other farm produ	uction expense	s	
Geographic area	Farr	ms	Val	ue	Far	ms	Valu	ie	Far	ms	Val	ue	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Delaware Kent New Castle Sussex	785 261 71 453	4.7 10.0 12.3 5.2	13 804 5 854 2 359 5 592	1.4 2.0 2.4 2.5	2 491 732 308 1 451	1.7 2.9 2.6 1.6	3 176 1 025 489 1 662	2.9 4.6 15.2 1.3	2 409 750 292 1 367	1.9 2.8 2.2 2.2	51 925 10 499 5 332 36 094	. 5 1.0 1.9 .5	
	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹				Total cropland				Harvested cropland				
Geographic area	Farms Value			Farms			es	Far	ms	Acres			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Delaware Kent New Castle Sussex	2 627 780 335 1 512	1.5 2.2 1.4 1.3	108 998 17 430 5 178 86 390	1.1 3.6 11.9 .9	2 162 713 315 1 134	1.6 2.0 1.4 1.4	495 156 166 177 73 436 255 543	. 7 .9 .6 .7	1 956 656 277 1 023	1.6 2.1 1.5 1.5	470 348 156 962 67 852 245 534	. 7 .9 .7	
	'	Irrigate	d land			Livestock and poultry							
	Farı	me	۸۵۰	roc		Cattle and ca	lves inventory			Beef cows	inventory		
Geographic area	I all	1115	Acres		Farms		Total		Farms		Total		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Delaware Kent New Castle Sussex	352 99 40 213	1.6 2.8 3.4 1.8	61 774 20 283 2 033 39 458	. 4 .6 1.3 .4	411 217 63 131	2.0 2.6 3.9 2.5	28 838 13 097 3 446 12 295	. 8 1.4 2.0 .6	34	2.8 4.0 5.8 3.6	2 856 1 283 500 1 073	3.3 5.2 7.6 3.9	
						Livestock and	poultry -Con.						
		Milk cows	inventory			Hogs and pig	s inventory			Sheep and lamb	os inventory		
Geographic area	Farı	ms	Tot	tal	Far	ms	Tota	al	Far	ms	Tot	al	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Delaware Kent New Castle Sussex	137 104 12 21	2.6 3.4 5.0	8 659 4 628 1 371 2 660	.5 1.0 .3 -	205 72 11 122	2.4 4.8 9.6 2.0	58 913 5 880 630 52 403	. 7 3.7 3.6 .7	72 30 11 31	4.2 6.5 10.1 5.7	1 856 823 238 795	6.6 4.9 9.2 14.1	

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviation	ons and symbo	ls, see intro	ductory text	:]												
	Livestock and poultry —Con.															
Geographic area	Hens and pullets of laying age inventory								Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold							
	Farms				Total			Farms					Total			
	N	umber	star err esti	lative indard for of mate cent)	Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	1	Numbe	er	Relativ standa error estima (percer	rd of te	Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Delaware Kent New Castle Sussex		112 76 16 20	4.5 6.2		510 718 66 857 209 195 234 666		. 7 5.3 (L) (L)	870 115 8 747		8	9	.6 .2	223 328 864 (D) (D) 194 185 730		.1 (D) (D) .1	
	Selected crops harvested															
	Corn for grain or seed							Wheat for grain								
Geographic area	Farn	าร	Acres			Quantity		Farms			Acres		Quantity			
	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Numb	Relativ standar error o estimat per (percent	d f e	Bushels		Number	sta e es	elative andard error of stimate ercent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Delaware Kent New Castle Sussex	1 029 315 144 570	1.7 2.4 2.0 1.7	154 2 43 1 32 0 79 0	91 1. 48 .	1 4 88- 7 3 97:	2 044 4 247 5 268 2 529	1.0	599 261 78 260		1.7 2.4 2.6 1.7	61 754 26 850 9 643 25 261	. . 1.2 .8	2 1 487 3 568	791 531	. 7 1.2 .9 .8	
Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.															
	Barley for grain								Soybeans for beans							
	Farn	ns		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity				
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Numb	Relativ standar error o estimat per (percent	d f e	ushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	sta e es	elative andard error of stimate ercent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		shels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Delaware Kent New Castle Sussex	323 138 22 163	1.8 2.5 4.4 2.1	37 5: 20 0: 1 4: 16 0	20 . 81 3.	7 1 499 2 102	5 621 9 384 2 759 3 478	2.2	1 324 433 126 765		1.7 2.2 2.1 1.6	231 872 81 650 25 591 124 631	. . 1.1 .9	2 486	618 300	. 8 1.0 .9	
Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.															
	Hay-alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see							text) Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)								
	l	Ac	Acres Qua			antity			Farms			Acres				
	sta e es		Relative tandard error of stimate ercent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Tons, dry	Rela stand erro estim (perc	dard or of nate	1	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Numbe	er	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Delaware Kent New Castle Sussex	42 22 8 12	10 8	2.1 2.7 3.0 3.1	11 947 4 724 3 283 3 940	2	2.0 2.4 5.0 2.1	30 451 11 344 9 663 9 444		1.9 2.3 4.2 2.4		271 82 32 157	1.9 3.2 5.3 2.1	42 38 16 74 1 06 24 56	4 9	.3 .6 1.6 .4	

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Table G. State Estimates of the Not on the Mail List Component of Farm Coverage Error: 1992

[Detail may not add to total due to rounding. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

	Census publ	ished farms	Not on n	nail list 1	Percent not on mail list ¹			
Item	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (percent)	Standard error of percent		
Farmsnumber_	2 633	1.4	360	41.3	12.0	4.4		
Land in farmsacres	589 189	.8	24 390	43.0	4.0	1.6		
Average size of farmacres	223.8	.7	67.8	59.6	(X)	(X)		
Farms by size: Less than 10 acres 10 to 49 acres Less than 50 acres 50 acres or more 50 to 99 acres 100 to 179 acres 180 acres or more	421	1.4	96	69.3	18.6	10.5		
	797	1.6	142	63.3	15.1	8.1		
	1 218	1.4	237	56.1	16.3	7.7		
	1 415	1.7	122	55.1	8.0	4.0		
	380	2.4	29	100.0	7.0	6.5		
	345	2.8	37	71.3	9.6	6.2		
	690	1.5	57	62.1	7.6	4.4		
Harvested cropland farms acres	1 956	1.6	256	38.2	11.6	3.9		
	470 348	.7	14 807	47.7	3.1	1.4		
Farms by value of sales: Less than \$1,000 \$1,000 to \$2,499 Less than \$2,500 \$2,500 or more \$2,500 to \$9,999 \$10,000 or more	201	3.3	66	61.1	24.7	11.4		
	191	3.7	111	52.0	36.7	12.1		
	392	2.9	176	51.4	31.0	11.0		
	2 241	1.3	183	61.2	7.6	4.3		
	465	2.7	100	101.8	17.7	14.9		
	1 776	1.2	83	51.5	4.5	2.2		
Market value of agricultural products sold\$1,000	559 766	.1	2 587	41.9	(L)	(L)		
Farms by standard industrial classification: Crops (01) Livestock (02)	1 338	2.1	272	38.0	16.9	5.3		
	1 295	.9	88	72.0	6.4	4.3		
Farms by type of organization: Individual or family Partnership or corporation Other	2 226	1.5	313	43.6	12.3	4.7		
	394	1.4	17	88.7	4.1	3.5		
	13	8.3	30	100.0	69.7	21.2		
Farms by tenure of operator: Full owners	1 607 1 026 788 238	1.4 1.5 1.5 2.6	261 97 97 –	49.2 54.2 54.2 (X)	14.0 8.7 11.0	5.9 4.3 5.3 (X)		
Operators by place of residence: On farm operated Not on farm operated Not reported	1 956	1.4	314	46.0	13.8	5.5		
	436	2.0	-	(X)	_	(X)		
	241	2.0	46	92.9	15.9	12.4		
Operators by principal occupation: Farming Other	1 578	1.3	82	52.5	4.9	2.5		
	1 055	1.9	226	45.9	17.6	6.7		
Operators by sex: Male Female	2 346	1.4	308	38.3	11.6	3.9		
	287	1.6	51	101.8	15.2	13.1		
Operators by race: WhiteBlack and other races	2 587	1.4	319	42.6	11.0	4.2		
	46	5.5	39	99.1	46.0	24.6		
Operators by years on present farm: 4 years or less	236	2.5	52	100.1	18.1	14.9		
	1 912	1.4	225	48.2	10.5	4.5		
	19.8	2.1	16.2	69.8	(X)	(X)		
Not reported	485	1.8	82	59.2	14.5	7.3		
Average age of operator	52.7	.2	57.3	58.3	(X)	(X)		

NOTE: These estimates do not account for incorrectly classified farms or farms appearing more than once in the census and are subject to change in the 1992 Coverage Evaluation publication. See appendix C text for further explanation.

¹Estimates are based on a sample survey conducted independently of census data collection.